

**THE JEWISH
REFUGEE PROBLEM**

By BRUCE BLIVEN

AND

**THE EGREGIOUS GENTILE
CALLED TO ACCOUNT**

By GROVER C. HALL

△

L.I.D. PAMPHLET SERIES
LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY
112 EAST 19TH STREET, NEW YORK CITY

15c

INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

PERIODICAL STUDIES IN ECONOMICS AND POLITICS

Eight Monthly Issues During the Year, Each
Devoted to a Detailed Work of Research on a
Current Vital Problem—the Kind of Authentic
Research Material You Can't Get Elsewhere
and 4 Bulletins.

SUBSCRIPTION: \$1.00 PER YEAR

BOARD OF EDITORS

MARY FOX
HAROLD GOLDSTEIN
ABRAM HARRIS
SIDNEY HOOK
HARRY W. LAIDLER
JOSEPH P. LASH
ROBERT MORSS LOVETT

ALONZO MYERS
ORLIE PELL
CARL RAUSHENBUSH
ESTHER RAUSHENBUSH
JOEL SEIDMAN
THERESA WOLFSON
ROBERT G. WOOLBERT

Forthcoming Issues Include

LABOR, THE MACHINE AND THE DEPRESSION

by ALFRED BAKER LEWIS

TRENDS IN THE U.S.S.R.

by JOEL SEIDMAN and
NORMAN THOMAS

PROBLEMS IN MEXICO

by CLARENCE SENIOR

The League for Industrial Democracy is a membership society engaged in education toward a social order based on production for use and not for profit. To this end the League conducts research, lecture and information services, suggests practical plans for increasing social control, organizes city chapters, publishes books and pamphlets on problems of industrial democracy, and sponsors conferences, forums, luncheon discussions and radio talks in leading cities where it has chapters. Its Officers for 1937-8 are:

President: ROBERT MORSS LOVETT

Chairman of the Board of Directors: NORMAN THOMAS

JOHN DEWEY	ALEXANDER MEIKLEJOHN
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES	MARY R. SANFORD
JAMES H. MAURER	VIDA D. SCUDDER
FRANCIS J. McCONNELL	HELEN PHELPS STOKES
Treasurer: REINHOLD NIEBUHR	

Executive Director:
HARRY W. LAIDLER

Field Secretary:
JOEL SEIDMAN

Executive Secretary:
MARY FOX

ETHAN EDLOFF, Detroit Secretary

Write for Information Regarding Membership

LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

112 East 19th Street, New York City

THE JEWISH REFUGEE PROBLEM

By BRUCE BLIVEN

AND

THE EGREGIOUS GENTILE CALLED TO ACCOUNT

By GROVER C. HALL

△

11

L. I. D. PAMPHLET SERIES
LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY
112 EAST 19TH STREET, NEW YORK CITY

15c

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Dedication to B. Charney Vladeck	3
THE JEWISH REFUGEE PROBLEM	5
by Bruce Bliven	
Barbarism, Incorporated	5
How Many Jews?	9
A History Written in Blood	10
Government by Terror	11
Nazi Voodoo	13
Where Can They Go?	15
Germany's Loss is Our Gain	20
Refugee Immigrants: Can We Afford Them?	23
THE EGREGIOUS GENTILE CALLED TO ACCOUNT	27
by Grover C. Hall	

To

B. CHARNEY VLADECK

Courageous, clear-visioned and eloquent Socialist through whose untimely death, the League for Industrial Democracy has lost a valued member of its Board of Directors. His insight and increasing labors gave inspiration and leadership to those who seek to bring about a free and just society!

"No supercilious intellectual, no prophet of dictatorship can tell me that Democracy is a sham. For, like so many millions of other Americans by choice, I was born and brought up under a tyranny, and I tasted of its bitter fruit. Education was denied to everybody but a few, freedom of movement was restricted, opportunities were destroyed, lives were stunted. Many of us went to jail at an age, when your children here go to high school, not because of preaching violence, or championing anarchy, but because we wanted to think and educate ourselves. Just listen to the terrible, deadening silence that is falling upon a great part of the world today like a sinister shroud of death. Italy, Germany, Austria, Russia—for how many decades have their best sons fought for the right of self-expression, for liberty of thought, of meeting, of organization. Today nearly half of the world has lost its voice. What you hear is not the happy full-throated articulation of people awakening to the joy of creation, but the sharp, terrible voice of the whip cutting the air with fateful force to fall upon the backs of bleeding nations.

In these torture chambers of Fascism and tyranny, the Jew occupies a conspicuous and painful place. As workers, we are persecuted for being militant; as traders, for being greedy. If we produce geniuses we are charged with disrupting the world; if we produce criminals we are charged with corrupting it. When we give our lives for liberty we are contemptuous internationalists. When we comply and obey we are cowards. One of the most important reasons why all tyrants hate us is because of our long experience in resisting injustice and cruelty. Over four thousand years ago a Jew by the name of Moses, himself an intellectual, led the first great strike of bricklayers at the Pyramids, and since then all Pharaohs are our enemies.

"Why do the Jews persist? Why not forget that you are a Jew? This is a fair question. I can assure you that this is no easy burden to carry—this knowledge that the erosion of

472921

time has carved your face; that all the storms of history moulded your mind; that the injustices of a thousand tyrannies have settled in your soul. If you think into the matter a little deeper, you will find that there is no reason why one, in crossing the ocean, should be required to drop everything to the bottom. Our modern conception of a good American is one who, whether or not he knows the language, whether or not he is externally a conformist is ready to use his intelligence and his patriotism to make this country a better and a happier one for all. In this fight you are not as much concerned with externals as with real values. And I can tell you that, irrespective of the language we speak and the appearance we make, the foreign-born workers in this country are among the most intelligent, constructive and militant elements in the American Labor Movement.

But now I come to the most important point of all. And that is the fact that since the coming of the industrial age the Jews have been a true barometer for the Labor Movement. Whenever and wherever a government begins to persecute the Jews, it inevitably follows with persecuting the workers. Whatever the name of the country and whatever the location, the quality and the liberty, or the lack of them, enjoyed by Jews is likewise true of Labor. This is why Organized Labor throughout the world, outside of sentimental reasons, is against anti-Semitism, because it knows that the first blast against the Jews is only the forerunner of a dark storm against Labor; that permitting a government to foster anti-Semitism is to strengthen a power that will crush Labor. This is why in all countries today conscientious and intelligent Jews march with Labor, and why Labor is the staunchest defender of Jewish rights. So I appear before you this morning as one who is doubly interested in this fight against Fascism. And with all the earnestness and solemnity that I possess, I swear to you that Jewish Labor, both here and throughout the world, will not give up, will not falter or weaken until the last trace of tyranny is wiped off the earth, and until Labor regains its unions, its cooperatives, its press, its liberty, its industrial, cultural, and political power!"

From a speech by B. Charney Vladeck at The American Federation of Labor Convention, San Francisco, 1934.

THE JEWISH REFUGEE PROBLEM.

By

BRUCE BLIVEN

Barbarism, Incorporated

Europe today is filled with homeless, wandering refugees—victims of man's inhumanity to man. They come from half a dozen countries and they include men, women and children of all social classes and very nearly every type of misery with which the human race can be afflicted. There are hundreds of thousands of Spaniards who have stumbled wearily across the border, escaping from Franco to unbearable conditions in French concentration camps. As I write, many hundreds of Jewish refugees from Italy are suffering dreadful hardships in the snows of the Alpine passes. In France, Belgium, the Netherlands, the Scandinavian countries and Great Britain are found in varying numbers those who have fled before the terror in Nazi Germany and in the lengthening list of countries where German doctrines are increasingly practised.

Nothing in modern times has created so much moral indignation throughout the world as what has been done by Hitler in the past six years. Cruelty is not new; it exists in all countries and is enormously increased in time of war. Injustice is not new; nearly all states have been founded on it and have maintained themselves by means of it. Nevertheless it is a fact that in modern times we have rarely seen cruelty and injustice on such a scale as in Germany under Hitler, where they have been raised to an exact science and universally exercised.

The first question to be asked is whether the Nazis know what they are doing, whether they realize what a complete departure their conduct is from the standards of civilized countries. On this point their own testimony is adequate.

Over and over again, beginning with Hitler himself, they have expressed their approval of terrorism as a device of the state to maintain itself. They have only contempt for the actions and theories of less ruthless regimes. They sincerely believe that the future belongs to force and force alone, that in the perspective of a few hundred years hence we shall look back upon the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as a brief and artificial interregnum of comparative tolerance and kindness in a world history of power politics enforced by the sword. Just as they believe in lying ruthlessly both abroad and at home, in pursuit of their policies, so they apply, likewise in both areas, force or the threat of force to achieve their will.

Such doctrines as these, I repeat, are nothing new in history. Every state produces numbers of people who are fascists at heart, and in numerous cases in the past they have reached positions of authority where they could affect the lives of thousands, perhaps millions, of their fellow human beings. Nazism is unique only because it comes so late in the day, in a time when civilized doctrines had really made some headway in the Western world and because the German temperament, with its plodding industry and thoroughness, produces particularly horrible results when it is plodding and thorough in the application of sadistic torture.

The refugee question is not exclusively German, or exclusively Jewish, although many hasty headline-readers of today probably think it is. There are other countries than Germany that are beginning to act in the same way, or have long done so. Most ridiculous of all of them is Italy which, out of courtesy to the other end of the Rome-Berlin axis, has suddenly begun to persecute her tiny handful of Jews. Hungary, also, signalizes her new affiliation with Berlin by increasing her hostility to the Jews, driving many of them out of business, the professions and land ownership and ordering the deportation of many thousands. Czechoslovakia in the interval between the Munich Pact and her destruction in March, 1939, copied Germany; Poland and Rumania have always had strong anti-Semitic movements that are now greatly aug-

mented. The same is true of all the East European countries, whether Balkan or Baltic. Not until you come to Soviet Russia do you find a country where a Jew is treated like anyone else. As the small states in Europe increasingly realize their dependence on Hitler, this dependence finds first expression in an acceptance and application of Nazi dogmas.

The refugee problem is not exclusively Jewish. The vast armies of homeless that have drifted through Europe for twenty-one years or more began with political exiles and will doubtless end with them. Every revolution releases a new flock of those whose lives are no longer safe in their homelands. In recent years the greater number of these exiles have been liberals and radicals spewed out by countries where humanitarianism, openly adhered to, has become the equivalent to a death warrant.

From the beginning the Hitler regime has had three great groups of enemies, according to its own interpretation; radicals, Christians and Jews. All three have been persecuted, though not simultaneously. The radicals and the liberals were hunted down from the first, the excuse being the fear, in part well founded, that they would plot for the overthrow of the Nazis. The Jews were also a scapegoat from the beginning, but in the early days pressure against them was comparatively light. It has become more and more severe as economic conditions in Germany have grown worse. Jewish property has been confiscated partly for the benefit of the state and partly for that of individual Nazis. Jews have been driven from business and the professions so that there would be more room for Nazis in these occupations. Wealthy Jews have been kidnapped and held for ransom precisely in the technique of Chicago gangsters of the prohibition era. At present a high ransom for all the Jews in Germany is demanded from the other nations of the world as the only way to "solve" the Jewish refugee problem.

In part, no doubt, the Nazis have been the victims of their own propaganda. At first they lied to the masses about the Jews, perhaps despising the gullibility of poor Hans who swallowed this nonsense. Gradually, however, they have come to

believe more and more of it themselves, until it is no longer possible to distinguish between cold-blooded falsehood and a mass hysteria that can hardly be told from the generalized insanities of the Middle Ages when whole communities would dance for days, or would set off on meaningless migrations, they knew not where. Today, the open purpose of the German state is to seize every scrap of Jewish property, to dispose of every man, woman and child with Jewish blood in his veins, either by enforced migration or by enforced destruction at home.

The turn of the Christians is coming next. A fact that is too often overlooked is that Nazism is definitely pagan. It worships the old Teutonic hierarchy of gods, and while some of this worship is semi-ironic, much of it is quite sincere. The German has never been known for his sense of humor, or at least for one that could be so recognized in any other country. Add to this native disability the ferocious training that German youth now receives, and there is no reason why, in a few years, we should not have a country indistinguishable in its culture and ideology from the Germany of two thousand years ago.

The attack on the churches partakes of the qualities of both the fight against the radicals and that against the Jews. Like the radicals, the churches both Protestant and Catholic are centers of possible resistance to the regime. Pastor Niemöller is a dangerous symbol; the churches throughout all history have produced martyrs who would continue to resist even while the flames licked their feet. Like the Jews, the churches have valuable property to be confiscated. The Catholics in particular have vast possessions on which the Nazis have long turned covetous eyes. The attack on the Catholics has only been delayed, it is probable, by the necessity for keeping on some sort of terms with the Church until the Spanish adventure was ended. Seen in such a light, the attitude of the pro-Franco American Catholics seems doubly stupid and shortsighted: the second lamb in the line assists the butcher to cut the throat of the first.

How Many Jews?

A reader of the anti-Semitic rubbish published in Germany might suppose that the Jews constituted a large proportion of the total population there, and certainly a larger one than exists in any other country. Yet a glance at the facts tells us how absurd such a theory is. Of the ten countries of the world which have any considerable number of Jews, Germany ranks ninth from the top. The only nation with a still smaller proportion is Italy. Poland heads the list with a Jewish population of about 9.5 percent. Rumania comes next with a little more than 5 percent, and Hungary has slightly less. Fourth is the United States, with about 3.5 percent. Austria, before the Anschluss, had 3 percent. Soviet Russia has about 1.75 and Great Britain and France are roughly equal, each with slightly less than 1 percent. Germany has approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ of one percent, and Italy, only .0025. Of the four cities in the world which have the largest Jewish population, the first, third and fourth are in the United States. New York has 2,500,000; Warsaw, Poland, 353,000, Chicago 325,000 and Philadelphia 275,000. Next come London, 234,000; Budapest 230,000, Lodz, 202,000. We have to get down to the eighth city, before we reach Germany, and even then, the municipality is one that has only recently been incorporated in the Reich: Vienna, with 178,000 Jews. In short, the cold statistics prove that Germany's complaints against the Jews are a pack of lies. If other countries with many times greater Jewish population can and do live peaceably with them, the Germans could have done the same.

The Nazis will tell you that they had to act against the Jews because these were so rapidly gaining control of business and the professions. Official German statistics show the falsity of this charge. It is true that they constituted one-sixth of the doctors and one-fifth of the lawyers, but neither of these proportions could be called a dangerous one. After all, people presumably went to a man for legal or medical advice on a

basis of the merit of the individual, because he was a good lawyer or a good medical man.

Of those engaged in small business in Germany, the Jews constituted only 2.4 percent. Their department stores did only 3.9 percent of the total department store trade. They were no more than 3.3 percent of the bankers. These statistics refer to a time before the present persecution had been begun. The proportions would in all cases of course be far smaller today or would have been wiped out entirely by the recent discriminations.

A History Written in Blood

Germany certainly did not invent wholesale persecution of minorities, and most of all, wholesale persecution of the Jews. Theirs is a history written in blood, the history of a people who for two thousand years have lived as unwilling and often unwelcome guests in other people's houses, perennially made the scapegoat when things went wrong, perennially tortured and robbed by persons less thrifty than they have been forced by their situation to become. There is not one of the traits described by their enemies as characteristically Jewish that does not appear in a person of any other race—or more properly, any other religion, since the Jews can hardly be called a race—forced to live under similar oppression; I doubt if there is a Jew, taken out from under that oppression young enough, in whom these traits would not disappear.

Half an hour with an encyclopedia will give you some idea of the darker chapters in this dark history. As early as eight and a half centuries ago, there were pogroms in Germany herself, in one of which 12,000 Jews were killed in the Rhineland. A few years earlier they were being crucified by religious zealots in Spain. A millenium before that, they had been expelled by the order of the Claudius from Rome. Pope Innocent III was active against them from 1198 to 1216. They have been expelled wholesale from several countries, including England in

1290 and Spain in 1492. In the year 1506, two thousand were tortured to death in Portugal, and at about the same time a considerable number were burned alive at the stake in Italy. In modern times the most terrible pogroms have been those in Russia in 1903-06 in the course of which at least 25,000 were killed and more than 100,000 wounded. The Nazis, it is interesting to know, have studied carefully the history of earlier Jewish persecutions and have faithfully reproduced many of their details.

I do not propose here to enumerate all the discriminatory anti-Jewish laws passed by the Hitler government, but I will remind you of a few of the more striking provisions. One of the early acts of the Hitler government was to dismiss all Jews who held any sort of government position, which included of course many thousands of teachers in schools and universities. Jews are not permitted to advertise in "Aryan" newspapers, and almost every Jewish journal has been suppressed. No "Aryan" is permitted to be employed by a Jew. No Jew can buy real estate. A climax of some sort was reached on July 26, 1936, when special discriminations were levied against blind Jewish war veterans, who had sacrificed their eyesight in the service of their country. Today, the butchering of cattle according to Jewish religious rites is forbidden. Jews are prohibited from practising any of the professions. They are forced to use a specially published list of given names, which are of course avoided by everyone else, so that there is no such thing as passing as an "Aryan" without violating the law. Their property is systematically taken from them, seemingly in fulfillment of the Nazi scheme to render them so desperate they will become criminals and then to destroy them.

Government by Terror

As I have suggested, many Americans no doubt believe that wholesale mistreatment of innocent victims in Germany is a fairly recent thing that has come with the tightening up of the

Nazi Voodoo

restrictions on the Jews during the past few months. But this is not true. From its very beginning, the Hitler regime has operated through widespread terror. The earliest victims were not the Jews, but the liberals and radicals, just as the latest victims will not be the Jews but the labor unions, all political parties except the Nazi, the coöperatives, the Catholics and Protestants. The moment Hitler came to power, he instituted the policy of setting up vast concentration camps where all opponents of the regime were locked up and subjected to all the fiendish tortures that degenerate minds could conceive.

Among the majority that opposed Hitler, there were millions of Social Democrats and Communists, thousands of trade unionists and nearly all known leaders of these groups were arrested. Many of them are still in prison, if they have had the hardihood to survive their ghastly mistreatment. Many others have died under the lash, while some have been returned to their families completely broken. In the early days, not much was printed in America about the horrors of the concentration camps. There was a general feeling that the victims were only radicals, after all, and that it didn't matter greatly what became of them. While today we are extending our sympathy to the innocent victims of a great racial-religious tragedy, it is well that we should pause to recall the thousands who have suffered since the beginning of the regime.

I do not propose to make this brief essay a recital of the blood-chilling tortures that have gone on in the prison camps; whole books have already been filled with this dreadful story. It is interesting to note that sadistic degeneracy increases as the instinct for it is gratified. Thousands of young German men who, under other conditions, might have led sane and healthy lives, have obviously become the sort of sexual and moral pervert who delights to torture—a type thoroughly familiar in every handbook of abnormal psychology.

One hardly needs to say to American readers that there is no scientific basis whatever for the Nazi racial theories. The world's leading anthropologists unite in reporting that there is no fundamental and inherent difference between the potentialities of any race and any other. In the phrase the English are so fond of using, it is nurture, not nature, that creates most of our differences. As I have said, Judaism is a religion, not a race; it is a grave question whether there is any such thing as a Jewish racial stock. Every one of the so-called Jewish racial characteristics is missing among hundreds of thousands of persons of Semitic origin and possessed by hundreds of thousands of non-Jews. The Aryan theory, of course, becomes even more fantastically false when it is applied to persons who are only one-half, one-quarter or one-eighth of "Jewish blood."

Professor J. B. S. Haldane, the noted English biologist, has observed that the characteristics of the blood which the "Aryans" consider an identification of the pure Teutonic strain occur in their most emphatic form among certain types of the Chinese, while they are lacking among many of the proudest blond-headed Germans.

As suggested above, it is a question whether any important men in the Nazi party believe their own nonsense about the Jews. It may be that, hypocritical at first, they have finally fallen victims of their own propaganda. A man like Julius Streicher is probably stupid enough to believe anything—aside from the fact that his Jew-baiting brings him in a vast income.

Why did Hitler ever begin this campaign? And why does he continue it? There are two answers, both important. His original anti-Semitism, beginning many years before he came to power, was of course a shrewd political move. When people are unhappy, are poverty stricken and subject to injustice about which they are helpless, psychologically they feel great need of a scapegoat, and the Jews provided one in post-war Germany

as they have done on so many previous occasions in European history. The nonsense about the Jews is picturesque and exciting, it lends itself to dramatic political oratory, and the more stupid your hearer the more likely he is to be captured by it. Moreover, overt anti-Semitism becomes a beautiful way of paying off a grudge against a competitor, a business or social rival, who may be smarter than you are, more industrious, more far-sighted.

The other motive is one that is usually understressed: the economic basis for anti-Semitism. The Nazi regime in Germany, which has bankrupted the country's finance, has alleviated its own problem somewhat by confiscating hundreds of millions of dollars of Jewish wealth. Every time a Jewish physician is forbidden to practice, there is increased opportunity for an Aryan competitor who has not sufficient ability to win in an open race. Whenever a Jewish business man is forced to sell his enterprise at ten cents on the dollar, some good Nazi party member gets a chance to enter the same trade, or to expand his existing establishment, with no initial investment to speak of.

Few Americans realize the remorseless efficiency of the methods used to despoil the Jews of their property. They are most effective of course against those seeking to leave the country, who are forced to buy their freedom with a ransom consisting of virtually everything they have. Even household furniture, jewels, paintings and other valuable personal possessions are gathered in. The Jew is taxed heavily, and must turn his belongings into money for whatever they will bring. He is not however allowed to sell in the open market. He must go to certain specified dealers in second-hand goods who have instructions from the government to drive a hard bargain. (Why Hitler goes to this trouble, I do not know, since it would be simpler and hardly any more cruel simply to shoot the Jewish owner and carry off his worldly goods in a truck.)

Never in history have we seen such wholesale kidnapping for ransom as the Nazis have performed. When Austria was

seized, every wealthy Jew, as well as every other individual suspected of lack of sympathy with fascism, was clapped into jail. The actual political prisoners are still there, those who have not been killed or have died of their sufferings. Among the Jews, most of those possessed of any property have bought their release with virtually the entire amount. Not only is this true but Jews in other countries have been levied upon to aid their kinsmen. Time after time, a wealthy Austrian Jew would be promised his freedom on payment of a certain large sum—sometimes as much as or more than his total wealth. The payment would be made and his captors would then laugh at their promise, demanding fresh contributions. Hundreds of thousands of dollars were paid by American Jews and those in other lands, to buy the freedom of these unhappy captives.

The Jews having been squeezed dry, there is every evidence as I have said that extortion will now be practiced against other groups, probably beginning with the Catholics. This is not to say that they have not already suffered sharp persecution; but their property has not been taken from them in the systematic wholesale fashion that has been used against the Jews. There is no doubt however that their turn will come.

Where Can They Go?

With the sudden increase in mistreatment of the Jews in Germany, the question has become even more urgent as to where the refugees, whether Jewish or others, can go. We should note first of all that there are many people who believe it is a mistake for the democratic nations to assist their emigration. The argument is that by helping to get the refugees out of Germany and the other European countries which are with increasing severity following similar policies, we are playing into the dictators' hands: we are doing exactly what they want us to do. Those who take this view insist that the inhuman treatment of their minorities by these countries should

not be condoned; that, on the contrary, the rest of the world should demand that it be stopped, and should be prepared to back up this demand by force.

I am heartily in favor of doing everything that is possible, short of increasing the danger of another world war, to fight fascism in Germany and everywhere else. The forces within these countries that are resisting dictatorship, are deserving of all possible sympathy and support. It is quite possible, I concede, that so far as Germany is concerned, Hitler may have fallen before the last of the refugees—600,000 Jews and an undetermined number of additional non-Jews—have been removed from the country. Nevertheless, it is plain that whatever may be said theoretically for a policy of using force to bring mistreatment of minorities to an end, no existing government is willing to carry it out. Even Soviet Russia has made no formal protestation, so far as I am aware, and has done little if anything to facilitate the emigration of the victims. When the nations will not fight, or take a firm line, even if important interests of their own are at stake, as was the case with Great Britain and France at Munich, it is idle to suppose that they will do so in support of the principle of abstract justice to oppressed minorities.

No better illustration was ever given of the grim truth of economic determinism than is found in the history of negotiations for taking care of refugees. The story has never been told in detail, for diplomatic reasons, and it is so unpleasant that no one has any desire to recite it. In summary, however, it may be said that every country has been hospitable or inhospitable in approximately the degree to which it believed that the entrance of enforced emigrants would be a benefit or a harm. This has been true even of some important elements among co-religionists of the refugees who have on occasion offered objection to their being allowed to come in, when it was feared that they might offer economic competition to the existing population (this stricture, I am glad to say, does not apply against the United States).

Where can the refugees go? So far as the Jews are concerned, attention was naturally given first to Palestine, where a great immigration of Jews from many countries has taken place during the past two decades. But, unfortunately, Palestine has become a pawn in the game of international politics. The Rome-Berlin axis is greatly increasing its power in the Mediterranean, at the expense of Great Britain. If we look ahead a few years, it is far from certain that England will play the predominant role in Asia Minor that she now does. Palestine may come under the influence of countries which are themselves bitterly anti-Semitic. It may not be safe for the Jews.

Even if this does not happen, Palestine is far from being an ideal Jewish community. I have no space or inclination to discuss the Palestinian question in its full detail, but it is pertinent to observe that to the inevitable clash between two races differing in religion, background and ways of life have been added conflicts arising out of landlordism—on both sides—and other manifestations of private capitalism—on both sides. Arab nationalism has been whipped up by individuals seeking specific ends of their own, and no doubt has also to some extent been a sincere feeling of alarm lest the influx of Jews abroad should crowd the Arabs out. The ultimate solution is for the Arabs and the Jews to stand together for peace and against their oppressors of both races; but this is a long way off, and time won't wait.

Numerous proposals have been made for settling the refugees in various comparatively uninhabited parts of the world. The British have seriously discussed Tanganyika, but apart from every other objection the strong possibility that it may be returned to Hitler would seem an insuperable bar. Alaska has been widely talked of; it contains only a few thousand inhabitants, although it could support many more; there are great possibilities of developing a tourist trade there, and the Jews have shown that they are well adapted to the opera-

tion of hotels and allied activities. Lower California has been mentioned; it is argued that with large-scale irrigation projects, this arid land could be made almost as fertile and prosperous as the similarly treated sections of Palestine. Lower California is now part of Mexico, but has only a tiny population, and the Mexican government, whose financial troubles are extremely serious, might be willing to sell the territory, partly for cash and partly for a credit against expropriated foreign oil and agricultural lands. An objection, of course, is the possibility that Mexico might install a fascist regime with a strong anti-Semitic bias.

J. Russell Smith, the noted geographer, has suggested British Guiana in northeastern South America. He admits that the climate is almost unendurable for the white man, but thinks this can be solved by the use of air-conditioning, with an entire village all under one roof. He recognizes that outdoor agricultural labor would have to be done under tropic conditions, but asserts that white men can survive this comfortably if they can eat and sleep in air-conditioned houses. He thinks agriculture would form the main occupation of the colonists. "Guiana," he says,

"will afford the new colonists opportunity to grow plenty of carbohydrate foods, sugar, sweet potatoes, yams, bananas, corn and cassava. There is plenty of vegetable protein, beans of many kinds, including the soy bean which is one of the four perfect proteins. Another of the four perfect proteins is furnished by the Brazil nut which will also probably grow in this climate. Vegetable fat will be furnished by a number of edible palm oils and especially by the alligator pear, now growing in Guiana.

The coffee and cacao trees both thrive, as do many of the tropical fruits. Guiana is below the hurricane belt, and the resultant absence of destructive winds is a substantial asset.

Meat will be relatively scarce—this is not a land of good grass. There should be some fishing villages on the coast and a frozen fish service up the river.

A chief difficulty, Professor Smith points out, is the lack of a cash crop with which the new inhabitants of this country could finance their imports. Rubber, palm oil, palm nuts, Brazil nuts and tropic woods could be produced, but only in competition on the world market with the low-paid coolie

labor of the East Indies and therefore at impossibly low selling prices. He suggests that the colonists should manufacture shoes, create a chemical refining industry and in general try to manufacture in competition only with countries in the temperate zone where labor is better paid.

Other suggestions have been made as to possible homes for the refugees—Rhodesia, Central Australia, half a dozen of the South American countries. I do not propose to discuss them in detail, because I believe all these proposals are almost hopeless. The world has now had a long experience in large-scale resettlement and pioneering overseas. We know from what has been done in Australia and Canada, in particular, that it is useless to send people out as farmers unless they have definite technical skills, substantial experience, and a fairly large working capital. Even with free land and other state assistance, the general rule is that the pioneer must have a minimum of about \$1,000 in cash. These two requirements cannot possibly be met in regard to the would-be colonists from Central Europe. They do not have agricultural experience and there is no way to impart it in the brief period of time in which the operation must take place. Germany is systematically robbing her victims of all their wealth in whatever form it exists. She will not permit those who leave the country to take with them anything like a thousand dollars per family. As far as possible, the Nazis will prevent their victims from taking out any money at all. To provide for the comparatively small number of Jews in Germany would need \$150,000,000, even if the other conditions could be met.

Most serious obstacle of all is the fact that the refugees are not the sort of men and women to go and pioneer in Alaska or British Guiana. Heretofore frontiers have almost always been occupied by self-selected groups with very special characteristics. The overwhelming majority of the involuntary exiles are people of the lower middle class, small shopkeepers or traders. Many of them—an abnormally large proportion

of the total population—are intellectuals: doctors, lawyers, journalists, artists. Such people are helpless under the exigencies of rough agricultural pioneering. Their emotional mind-set is so much against this type of existence that one questions gravely whether even those of highest intelligence and firmest character could be successful.

We might as well face frankly the fact that, even under the best of circumstances, being driven into exile is a terrible psychic experience, so terrible that it leaves permanent scars. Human beings have a profound impulse to send down roots, and they suffer when these roots are violently broken off. In the case of highly gifted specialized individuals, writers, scientists or artists, qualities of tremendous value will survive the process of transplanting; but, for many others, this is not true. Time and time again the newspapers record suicides, or attempts at suicide, among refugees, here in America. At first glance, one might suppose that, once an exile had got safely out of Germany, and had established himself in the new world, his troubles would be largely over; yet many of the attempts at suicide have come precisely among these groups.

It is no possible solution to try to put the refugees whether Jews or non-Jews, off in some odd corner of the world. Being transplanted under the best of circumstances, to a civilization much like that from which they have come, will be for most of them a terribly difficult psychological experience. Human beings cannot be bandied about the world like chunks of wood. Unless the United States is prepared to open its own doors to substantial numbers, then the future is black indeed. And for that matter, it is black anyhow.

Germany's Loss Is Our Gain

Just how much Germany has lost by her policy of driving into exile many of her most brilliant scholars, artists, musicians, writers, inventors, no one will ever know. It is certainly striking that in the whole time since Hitler came to power

no great music has been written in that country, once the home of music; hardly a book has been published worthy of translation, hardly a picture painted that anyone except a zealot Nazi would care to see. In the field of science, there have been newspaper reports of a new microscope using the principle of atomic bombardment; and there have been other newspaper tales about an improved form of the autogyro. Against these exceptions must be placed the fact that many branches of science in Germany have simply degenerated. Psychology is one of them; no leading figure in the psychological world any longer takes seriously what is being done in Germany, where the state has solemnly placed psychoanalysis on the Nazi index expurgatorius and most of the former great figures of psychology are in exile.

Germany's loss is the gain of the rest of the world. Even a hasty and partial check reveals to what an extent our own culture has been enriched by the refugees or by the voluntary exiles who did not care any longer to remain in a country where barbarism is rampant. In the field of science, for a few examples, the United States can today claim Albert Einstein, James Franck, Nobel Prize winner for atomic research; Wolfgang Koehler and Kurt Koffka, psychologists; Hans Rosenberg, inventor of photoelectric cell devices; Kasimir Fajans, electrochemist; Kurt Wachtel, pharmaceutical chemist; Wilhelm Frei, dermatologist; Richard Goldschmidt, biologist; Carl Lange, bacteriologist; Siegfried Loede, pharmacologist; Rudolph Schoenheimer, biochemist; Max Goldschmidt, ophthalmologist.

Authors, artists and theatrical people include such names as Thomas Mann, Ernst Toller, Vicki Baum, Klaus Mann, Oskar Maria Graf, George Cross, Leo Rosner, Max Reinhardt, Elizabeth Bergner, Ernest Lubitsch, Eric Tomner, Hedy Lamar.

In the field of music we have Otto Klemperer, Julius Ehrlich, Bruno Eisner, Kurt Weill, Robert Robitschek, Felix Guenther, George Bertram, Edward Moritz, Ernest Toch, Ernst Gebert, Frank Waxman, Hans Eisler.

Among publicists there are Erich Hula, former Viennese Minister of Labor; Kurt Rosenfeld, former Prussian Minister of Justice; Heinrich Bruening, former German Chancellor, Hugo Breitner, for years the Social Democratic financial wizard of Vienna.

Scholars include Carl Brandt, ^{Berthold} Arnold Brecht, Gerhard Colm, Arthur Feiler, Emil Lederer, Hans Staudinger, Max Wertheimer, Frieda Wunderlich, William Stern, Paul Tillich, Richard Courant, Martin Sommerfeld, Hans Neisser, Walter Behrendt, Otto Nathan, Julius Lips, Eugen Rosenstock-Hussy, Alfred Vagts, Eduard Heimann, Albert Salomon, Fritz Lehmann, Carl Mayer, Hans Speier, Alfred Kahler, Felix Kaufmann, Arnold Brecht, Hans Simons, Felix Strauss.

There are also Alice Salomon, famous social worker, known as the Jane Addams of Germany; Lotte Jacobi, one of the world's most brilliant woman photographers; such architects as Walter Gropius and Paul Zucker; Max Rheinstein, Fritz Kessler and Rudolf Littauer, law teachers. Art and archaeology have given us Margarete Bieber, Walter Friedlaender, Ernst Herzfeld, Richard Krautheimer, Edwin Panofsky.

While this hasty list of course excludes hundreds of brilliant persons who have an equal claim to be included, it is certainly true that not all the future refugees, or even more than a small minority of them, may be expected to live up to the standard set here, just as it is also impossible to expect that these individuals will in all cases do the same brilliant work, make equally epochal discoveries, after they have been transplanted. It is certainly true, however, that even if we were to permit the entrance of every individual in Europe who is seeking to come to the United States—and no one suggests we should do anything so drastic as that—they would still be far superior as a group to millions of persons who are here already, some of them of foreign birth and others of our own "good old American stock." The refugee at any rate starts with one initial advantage in the race to see who

can become the best American: a profound sense of gratitude that he is allowed to be here and a keen realization of the blessing of liberty.

Refugee Immigrants: Can We Afford Them?

A strong case can be made for permitting refugees from fascist terror to enter the United States outside the present quota system, on moral and humanitarian grounds. If any action could be more consistent with historic American ideals, I do not know what it is. I prefer here, however, to discuss the more practical aspects of the question.

It is often said that we must not open our doors to these pitiful victims of man's inhumanity to man, because of the unemployment problem. With ten or twelve million people out of work, it is argued, we should be foolish to add to our burden by bringing in hundreds of thousands more.

No one with any understanding of economics would ever make such a statement. Whether you have unemployment or not does not depend on the size of your population but upon your economic system, the use you make of your resources. We had dreadful unemployment in the United States much of the time between 1870 and 1890, when the population was only about half as large as it is at present. We have had almost complete employment (that is, only between 2 and 3 million out of work on the average) during most of the decade of the 1920's, when our population was nearly as great as it is now. The point is that every addition to our population, whether by birth or immigration, is both a producer and a consumer. A hundred thousand people added to our population means a demand for a hundred thousand suits of clothes, three hundred thousand meals a day, twenty five thousand or thirty thousand houses, and so on. Even if we permitted the whole Jewish population of Germany to come to this country, and even if, what is wildly improbable, they all became unem-

ployed, the percentage of addition to our present problem would not be very serious. The overwhelming likelihood is that we could let in as many as can possibly get here, and never know the difference.

Since 1924, we have had a quota law which permits a specified number of immigrants to enter the country yearly. Since 1930 that number has been 153,714 annually; before that, it was about 10,000 larger. In fact, however, the world has not lived up to these possibilities. Some countries have failed to use up their quotas; many immigrants who came to America earlier have returned to their homes in Europe. In the past six years alone, our "deficit of immigrants" under both heads has been 1,030,000. In the same period of time, Germany and Austria have failed to live up to their combined quota allowance by 174,000 persons. On this basis, during the past twelve years, Poland owes us 47,471; Italy 47,293; Czecho-Slovakia—before being annexed by Germany—28,040. Even Rumania has a deficit of immigrants to this country of slightly more than 4,000. If these figures seem large, let me remind you that for many years the United States admitted *a million persons annually*, and no one thought anything of it.

Incidentally, anyone who fears that the Jews in America now constitute an important numerical proportion of our population, or are increasing rapidly, is not conversant with the facts. In 1936, the latest year for which reliable statistics are available, there were in the entire United States approximately 4,500,000 Jews, 3.5 per cent of our total population. This represented only an increase of 272,000 in ten years, by both birth and immigration. In other words, the Jewish population is nearly at a standstill. Most of us in the United States are here because in the past the doors have been opened and immigration has been encouraged. Many of us are descended from ancestors who came here as refugees and helped to build our country. Our tradition of asylum must be maintained and its continuance will strengthen, not weaken our

democracy. While we cannot dictate to other nations what they shall do about the refugees, we can insist that America shall maintain its historic policy and shall open its doors as widely as need be to the victims of political and religious persecution in other lands.

The Ultimate Solution

If we face the question honestly we must admit that millions of the world's homeless men and women will never find a refuge in new lands. Although their plight draws warm response from sympathetic millions in such relatively free countries as France, England, Mexico and the United States, the need increases faster than the means to care for it. No sooner do we rescue a few thousands from the nightmare of exile than we learn of some vast new expulsion. Today they come from Spain, Italy and Czecho-Slovakia; tomorrow from other lands as these in turn fall under Nazi domination. We should face squarely the fact that the governments of the world will not solve the problem of resettling a total of perhaps eight or ten million refugees.

The only real solution, in the long run, must lie in the restoration of sanity and the creation of a sensible economic order in those lands from which the refugees are being expelled. In Nazi Germany, for example, not only is there a widespread and growing resentment against the regime among many thousands of people, but there is a slow steady development of a conscious underground movement. It is still in a period of preparation, yet there is no doubt that it is growing and that it has proved its ability to function even under the Fascist terror. A recent article in the Survey Graphic by "Y" says:

Underground Germany has become more and more conscious that its task is one of preparing a framework. Its ideas are of a militant democracy. Its faithfulness is no longer merely to the task but to new responsibilities for the future of Germany. This new self-consciousness among underground workers is developing in a setting charged with a resurgence of sympathy toward them. Two years ago that setting was one of spiritual isolation. * * * The underground cadres may still be small, still weak but they are already a kind of sensory system with branches stretching out into every part of the German social anatomy. They are nuclei which will stimulate and gather about them mass movements of a democratic character that will prove important and decisive in the coming time of crisis.

If even one percent of the money now spent for relief and resettlement could be invested in keeping alive within Germany the hope for freedom, in aiding those Germans who work for a new democracy in their country, then our humanitarianism would indeed be realistic. We cannot hope to impose democracy upon Germany with armies, and there is no solution in bribing her either through the payment of ransoms or the reluctant purchase of her goods. We must recognize that the ultimate solution of the refugee problem lies with those forces in Germany which are now beginning anew the struggle for democracy and social justice against the most oppressive, highly organized gangster government the world has ever seen.

THE EGREGIOUS GENTILE CALLED TO ACCOUNT

Clinical notes on his lack of gallantry and sportsmanship, his bad mental habits, his tactlessness, his lack of imagination, his poor discernment, his faults as citizen and neighbor, his gullibility and arrogance.

By
GROVER C. HALL

Editor The Montgomery Advertiser

This article will not be taken, I trust, as a defense of the Jew, he that has been defended in 1,000,001 articles and books. Fortunately he does not stand in need of defense. But I can think of 100 reasons why his Gentile brother, usually ignored by critics, invites and deserves arraignment before the bar of his own conscience.

The Jew has spent his life as a race under a microscope designed and held by the Gentile. His blemishes stand out in bas relief on a canvas made by the same Gentile neighbor. His virtues are in the picture to be sure, but they stand obscurely in the background. The effect of the portrait is that of a vast, libelous caricature made by a thick-fingered, unimaginative artist. The Jew has been either too charitable or too circumspect to retaliate in kind. He holds no microscope over the Gentile to paint a character study of the most incredibly irresponsible of all the despots.

The earth swarms with men who think they are experts on the Jew. Nobody attempts a critical estimate of the Gentile as a Gentile. Nobody audits his balance sheet. Nobody invites him to give an account of his long and unbroken stewardship as the undisputed master of the human race. The Gentile has more power and has held it longer than any other vested interest in history. He has escaped critical questioning and comment longer than any other.

I, for one, marvel at this escape of the Gentile from accountability and justice. I marvel that his meanness, his pettiness, his arrogance, his snobbishness, his ill manners, his ungallantry, his poor sportmanship, his bogus humanitarianism, his sheer blindness to his own higher interests, have not been brought more sharply under notice. It would surely do the Gentile good to have his character plumbed in his peculiar relation to the Jew, however satisfactory his character may seem to be in other relationships. If the Gentile could but bring himself to face his own microscope, held in his steady, ruthless hand, the experience might indeed save him from the possible disaster which his demeanor invites.

Surely a citizen may claim the right to protest against the folly if not the vice of those who may injure him by thoughtlessly encouraging, in various ways, both subtle and gross, the ever-present rogues and fools in society to violate the ideals that fixed the pattern of this federation of neighborhood democracies, the Republic of the Oceans.

We think we do no harm to ourselves and our common institutions when in individual social relations we patronize the Jew. We think we are shrewd, discerning fellows when in contemplating a citizen and neighbor who happens to be a Jew we think of him and discuss him first as a Jew and then as whatever else he may be. We attribute virtues to him as a class that are characteristic only of individuals; we attribute vices and frailties to him as a class that any man of sense should know are peculiar only to individuals, whether Jews or non-Jews.

Thus we hound the Jew while imagining ourselves to be his friends—meaning by we those of us that comprise the majority of Americans and would not consciously injure the Jew. Our great transgression is that we do not measure our demeanor to make it conform to our responsibility. We forget that the fools who form our mobs may be influenced profoundly by the manners and prejudiced deportment of people of their own kind above them in the scale of life. Every ill-considered act

or word of the influential Gentile is food and drink to the passions of the lower order of man, who, once inflamed to madness by bitter fortune, having nothing of his own to lose, acts to destroy the things that are dear to others. Grave anxieties in this connection are warranted, as we shall presently see, if we will but take a long enough view of the story of man's inhumanity to man, even in our own most-favored country. If this be true let us, then, fix the responsibility.

* * * * *

Experience and personal observation over a period of years have taught me the only lesson that my faculties, being what they are, could receive, that often we have reason to deplore the thing that makes one a Gentile and does not at the same time make him an adequate humanitarian, an adequate neighbor and an adequate citizen.

Now I personally do not mind being a Gentile and I have no disposition to low-rate the status of the Gentile. There is a distinct advantage now as ever in the past in being one. We Gentiles are now and have been throughout history in the majority, the great majority—so much so indeed that the Gentile has since the bright dawning constituted the greatest single vested interest known to time and space.

Our political and social position is more secure. We make more money than the Jews. We control the earth and we know nothing of the bitterness that flavors the acrid cup of a helpless minority group. Indeed we as Gentiles have been so long in possession of the earth, so long in undisputed power, politically, economically and spiritually that we have never had any opportunity to know whether in facing an invincible oppressor of our kind we would be brave. If there were only 15,000,000 of us today as against 1,985,000,000 Jews in the world, how would our wits and instincts stand the test, if our dignity as a group should be affronted?

We Gentiles suffer mostly in this world from our own folly, not from the sins of others, for all our occasional unsporting

readiness here and there in our invulnerable empire to attribute some of our misfortunes, great and small to those who while birthing a god, never followed him. Whenever Gentiles in difficulties make the Jew their scape-goat they seem infantile.

We Gentiles sit on top of the world and rule it. I, as a Gentile, know that if I wish I can lie, steal, murder, get drunk, burn a house, loot a government or commit any other of the known indecencies, and that while I may be duly punished for my offense, I, instead of my kind, will be put on trial. In no circumstances would I hear the taunting phrase: "Gentile! Catch him!"

And so, I do not mind being a Gentile. It is profitable, it is pleasant, it is safe. There is nobody to oppress me or offend me for being one. Notwithstanding that I'd rather be a martyr than anything else except a millionaire, I like the All-Aryan rug that warms such a lowly bug as I on damp, chilly days. I am a Gentile and nothing on Yahweh's earth can alter that fact. That fact means security for me in every storm that does not ruthlessly strike down all peoples, regardless of race or creed.

In fine, we Gentiles will be the last to succumb in any circumstances. I am sitting pretty, primarily because of the accident of birth and geography, but also because of the obtuseness if not the dullness, the smugness and the arrogance, if not the sheer ungallantry of my compeers in Aryanism.

Naturally, the violent, brutal anti-Semite is revolting to me, even as he is probably revolting in ordinary circumstances to 90 per cent of my fellow American Aryans—but I am not at this point thinking of the Vulturebund. I am thinking rather of the type of American who while he says and no doubt believes he would fight to protect the Jew's civil rights, nevertheless is an awkward, lumbering fellow in his relation to the Jew. He may be free of conscious malice, nevertheless he fails either to cultivate or feel the need of genuine talent for living the day by day life of the good neighbor to all who are worthy of neighborliness. He is not sensitive, not intuitively understanding and gracious. He is outwardly kind to Jews, but only be-

cause of the practical discipline of memory, plus a sense of expediency. He is tolerant only because of political axioms he has heard and likes to taste and roll in his mouth when he has an audience. He is often patronizingly tolerant, his good will is a synthetic product, not a delicate flowering of the human spirit.

And so at the moment I am not thinking of the more vicious and aggressive anti-Semite who outrages the majority of Gentiles in this free American atmosphere, but of Aryans who merely pain and sadden me. I have in mind rather the ox and the ass of Aryanism, particularly many, but not all, of the "Some of my best friends are Jews" boys and girls. Of the vicious fanatic more anon.

Now, of course there are many unpleasant Jews—but they pain and grieve the men and women of good sense and good instincts who are of their kind. Even so, it seems to me that there is a higher proportion of Nordic Gentiles who habitually jar the sensibilities of well disposed people. There is a higher proportion of Nordics whose principles are not lofty, whose manners are crude, whose good taste is low, whose pride is a kind of juvenile vanity rather than the mark of innate dignity of character, in other words they are just chimpanzees with clothes on. These are rendered the more ignoble because they are conscious of their overwhelming strength so long as blood, geography and tradition give them sanctuary.

* * * * *

In Nazi Germany I should probably be accounted eligible for all the current benefits of citizenship. My line must have been purged soon after the panic in the Garden of Eden. I am Anglo-Saxon-Pict-Celt-Welsh, out of an interminable line of deepwater Baptists. In my boyhood I broke furrows, planted crops and went to school in a rural Alabama county. It was nine miles from my home to the nearest railroad. My forebears on both sides Lindberghed in a lumbering, leisurely manner across the Atlantic, the biggest ocean then known to them, and

some of them later became involved in the American Revolution. I am assured that my body cells have been exposed to disease and other misfortunes in every war that has been fought by our country except the Indian riots before Paul Revere buckled on his saddle. All of my boyhood associates and acquaintances were Gentiles and Protestants and with the exception of the blackamoors around about, all of them were Nordics. At the time I left home in 1905 my county had never been the home of a football player, a Harvard graduate or a Roman Catholic. Only three or four Jewish families resided in it. One Jewish merchant at the county seat was rather celebrated for his readiness at physical combat. In his day he licked a good many men who affronted him. He was game, and that is a virtue that even a Nordic bounder can respect.

In due time I became what is euphemistically known as a Substantial Citizen, otherwise the editor of a daily newspaper. I achieved a satisfactory place in life. I married, I reproduced. When my family became ill we called doctors. Sometimes these doctors were Jews, sometimes Nordic Aryans. I had Jewish neighbors along with Catholic and Protestant neighbors, but that was after—or maybe it was how—I came to know that Jews were people like other people, a part of the warp and woof of the same country that had nurtured my ancestors and me, and not bearded patriarchs and merciless Shylocks. Indeed as a youth I had scarcely been conscious of the contemporaneous existence of Jews—they were not a part of my little world. I was neither for nor against them. If the Jew was a cunning menace to my world or a marked man to be tolerated only with suspicion, the fact had not lodged in the consciousness of the boy who at 19 arrived in the chief city of his State of the Deep South to seek employment as a printer. In need of a boarding house I found shelter in the home of a pleasant, rather pretty old Jewish lady who spoke broken English. I remained in her home for only a week, but I left it with a vivid impression of the charm of that small circle that lingers in my memory today. The old lady mothered me in about the same way that my own

mother would have cared for any strange youth under her roof. From all I could see, despite their lowly, obscure state, these people were living this life as wholesomely and pleasantly as any Aryans in like circumstances that I knew. In this my first intimate personal contact with the children of Israel, I, a Nordic, Christian country boy could discern no characteristic quality in them except their speech to differentiate them significantly from other people of their rank and importance. I have often since compared them in my mind to the modest, diffident, self-effacing Aryan bounders who in my part of America are as commonplace as short-leaf pines, dog kennels and leaking roofs . . . I have often recalled how far removed from the status of "rich Jews" my friends were.

My second intimate contact with a Jew was at a boarding house in another town. He was a huge, absurdly fat man, an improvident tailor, a student of books and the perfect village atheist, the first I ever encountered. He was too poor to buy all the books he wanted, but his love of learning impressed me, his boldness as a thinker was not lost upon me.

As responsibilities grew, my contacts with Jews multiplied. I came to know Jewish teachers in our public schools, Jewish physicians, Jewish working men and working women.

I came early to see that there was no fundamental difference between Jews and Gentiles as such.

The difference always was between individuals, always between human beings.

* * * * *

Now I would not be regarded by cosmopolitans as a sophisticated person, since I am untravelled, having spent all of my life in a State that once was ruled by Ku Kluxers. But either I was born tolerant or I learned tolerance and acquired rather broad human sympathies after I came face to face with the basic realities of this life—at all events I came early in my days to like minorities and to distrust majorities with regard to all questions involving delicate human relationships and prejudice.

Certainly I have learned by simple observation of my fellows that a "sorry white man" is a sorry white man, whether he be Semitic or Nordic Gentile. Blatant, obnoxious human beings run true to a more or less fixed pattern everywhere at all times.

But if a "sorry white man" or a blatant, obnoxious white man happens to be a Jew, Gentiles, my brother Gentiles, I must sorrowfully report, are prone to notice first that he is a Jew and last that he is an objectionable human being.

If he be a Gentile it is remarked only that he is an objectionable human being.

It is never noticed that he is a Gentile.

Take annoying idiosyncrasies of personality in the cruder sort of man, or woman. There are Nordic Gentiles who use a table napkin for a kerchief on cold days, who eat peas with a knife, who violate all of the rules that polite people value. Some times they are rude and offensive in their personal relations. Some times their conduct is revolting, esthetically and morally—they rob, they swindle, lie and abuse whatever power they may have over others. But those whom they offend never think to say: "Gentiles! . . ."

Let a frustrated Jewish thinker turn Communist and we instantly hear it said by uncritical, gullible Gentiles, "Communism is a characteristic Jewish doctrine." But in the same country it is the "international Jewish banker," often an economic Tory, by all accounts, who has the mark of Cain upon him. It would appear from current literature here and in Germany that the Jew is at once the evil genius of Communism and the designing, sinister pillar of Capitalism—at once the money-hating Marxist and the money-lending Shylock. Numerous writers have pointed out that there is something wrong with this familiar picture, a picture that is made all the more grotesque when it is remembered that no American Jew has ever acquired a personal fortune comparable to that of Rockefeller, a Harriman, a Schwab, a Sage, a Du Pont or a Ford. Barney Baruch, he of an old-line, South Carolinian family, and the Strausses of an old-line, genteel Georgia family have probably

come nearest among American Jews to acquiring riches on such a scale. Mr. Baruch and the Strausses are and have been "liberals," neither dangerous radicals nor wicked Tories. The alien-born Otto Kahn was a multi-millionaire Jewish banker—and an international banker, at that!—but he was harmless socially and politically. He was merely obsessed with a desire to lead all Americans, Jews and Gentiles, into noble music halls where their souls would be cleansed and refreshed.

The Rosenwald Foundation is no menace to anybody—it is on the contrary the hope chest of millions of under-privileged Negro children.

Rabbi Stephen S. Wise is to be sure a pulpit rebel, but no more so than John Haynes Holmes, the expansive Nordic prophet, and but little if any more so than Harry Emerson Fosdick, the Nordic Baptist pastor of John D. Rockefeller, Jr.

Again disavowing any intention of special pleading for Jews, it is only proper to say that despite studied discrimination against them and contrary to the prejudiced impression of the more shallow-minded purged Nordics, Jews have had a distinguished military record in recent American history, a record which in truth, it must be owned, is slightly better than that of Aryan Nordics. The record shows that a smaller percentage of Jews than others have landed in jail. I say nothing of the admitted cultural eminence of Jews.

Now, why this appalling deficiency in human juices by which 1,985,000,000 mortals regard the frailties and virtues of 15,000,000 mortals as characteristic of their racial group? It is assumed of the 1,985,000,000 Gentiles that they have no uniquely characteristic frailties and virtues, but are just run-of-the-mine folks, some of whom are good, some bad, some gifted, some stupid, some healthy and strong, some weak, some prosperous, some poor, some backward, some advanced.

The Jew does naught to make this heterogenous mass of 1,985,000,000 people seek to attain solidarity but the 1,985,000,000 have by their ungallantry, their unsportingness, their lack of sensitiveness and insight, compelled 15,000,000 to seek

solidarity in sheer self-protection. This makes for introspection among Jews, it tends to bottle up in them the rich juices of the ages, thus depriving all mankind of the full measure of its inheritance in genius and grace.

* * * * *

It seems that in the relatively friendly social political atmosphere of our country Jews already have shown a tendency to lose their identity and their race-consciousness in exact ratio to their personal happiness as citizens and neighbors.

Here where prejudice is ordinarily passive and obscure our instinctive readiness to utter the proper noun "Jew" instead of the common noun "man" nevertheless is a blemish of personality to be deplored, a blemish which should be a reminder of an ever-present malady that once the tone of our social system is lowered may become virulent.

To be sure the historical circumstances (not nature) which made the Jew a tradesman and a financier have had their subtle influence in distorting the picture of this minority as put on canvas by an unchallenged, untroubled, arrogant, unfeeling majority.

The tragedy of it! Our American children romp together, go to school together, unconscious of any issue between them, as classes. One day a veil descends noiselessly between them. Those who yesterday were just children unaware of The Great Heritage, now are grown, and so are "Jews" and "Gentiles," with the exception of a minority in each group.

The Jewish parent sooner or later must face this searching, stabbing question from his child or her child, "Why am I different?"

When that question is raised and answered that moment the insidious seeds of cynicism are planted in the mind of that child, citizen of the republic, heir to this federation of neighborhood democracies.

The child may be of high birth and gentle rearing, it may even have genius to contribute to the common treasure chest of

the race—but one day it must hear from the lips of mother or father that it is in some obscure way "different" . . .

Gentiles did that!

Now if in time of common travail for our people, such for example as we have lately experienced, a bestial demagogue should find it in his heart to stir the passions of the foolish and dispossessed against the children of Israel, how could my son and my nephews and my nieces look into the anguished faces of their Jewish comrades next door, as they stiffened their backs to resist the surge of passion rising against the children of a small race that has given civilization so much of its flavor?

Be the explanation of this Gentile obtuseness what it may, it is but another contributory factor in the insidious malnutrition of the groping human spirit, a disorder that has handicapped mankind since the beginning of experience and contemplation. Now if the Nordic Gentile's reputation for acuteness, good manners and chivalry were all that is at stake in his awkward blundering, his insensate assertion of self-righteousness at the cost of happiness in others, might be dismissed with a shrug.

Unluckily, however, this is a practical world in which all our virtues derive from practical need, all our vices consist of disloyalty to practical values. If virtues had no practical value they would not be virtues, if vices did no practical harm they would not deserve the stigma attached to them.

* * * * *

If Henry Ford's anti-Semitic aberration had befallen him after October, 1929, instead of in the Golden Age that was the Harding-Coolidge Era when even the poor man's dough was relatively thick and sweet, we might have had a pogrom somewhere in these United States. Impossible? Don't be ridiculous! An American mob is as violent, as cruel and as blindly unreasoning as the mob of any other country. We have only to stir its passions to the bottom. We mobbed Tories and looted

them in the days of the Revolution. We mobbed Copperheads in the North in the sixties; we mobbed Unionists in the South. There were Southerners who given the chance would have dismembered Abraham Lincoln. There were Northerners who would have hung Jeff Davis to a sour apple tree. Coxey's Army would have slaughtered J. P. Morgan. In the black nineties there were Populite fanatics in Kansas, Nebraska, Georgia and Alabama who at a hint from Tom Watson would have welcomed an opportunity to lynch Grover Cleveland, William McKinley and Mark Hanna in a row. In the delirium of World War fever even the calmest of us looked with suspicion upon any citizen bearing a Teutonic name and we shrieked ominously at all dissenters against war. Ku Kluxism cut a long and tortuous trail of perfidy and stupidity in the twenties. Luckily for the Jews Ku Kluxism's hate was directed primarily at Roman Catholics who felt the full force of the stuffed hoods, but Jews, Negroes and "foreigners" did not by any means escape. At another time, under other conditions, Jews might easily be the chief object of the American mob's hatred. But for the mob's anti-papal obsession in the early twenties, and but for the people's sense of economic security and well-being Henry Ford's incredible blunder might have led to physical, economic and political persecution of Jews unparalleled in the history of American fanaticism.

Had this calamitous depression begun in 1920 I shudder to think what ghastly consequences to our people might have accompanied a crusade of so powerful and popular a man as Henry Ford was at that time. That the amiable, well-meaning Mr. Ford himself would have been appalled and sickened at excesses, physical or political, does not lessen the probability of excesses. In that event the republic would have been maimed for life. No other helpless minority could ever again have expected peace, security and the right to pursue happiness.

The American Jew today is fortunate that no Nordic scallawag and demagogue with the wit and boldness to release a

pestilence has risen to identify in the minds of the dispossessed and the despairing the Jew and the devil as one and the same.

The common sense and patriotism of the majority of the American people would no doubt be equal in the end to repressing such a mob, but not until after irreparable harm had been done. We have to remember that in the twenties a relatively mild form of Ku Kluxism swept like a plague through every State in this republic.

Put the American mob in rags and feed it on the crumbs that fall from the table of the man who still has an income, convince it that Israel's hosts are at its gate and it will pick up its flaming torch and march. The war that this mob fought in the early twenties with the Holy Roman Empire would fade into historical insignificance. For man, I regret to report, loves bread more than he loves God.

Chasms between groups in a democracy require more emergency bridges than the citizens of that democracy can afford to build, more than they are technically capable of building, however affluent, however resourceful they may believe themselves to be. The measure of a democracy's greatness and beauty is in the chasms it has closed by uniting sections of the good earth.

The hardened categories into which social, racial, and religious and political prejudices have forced the peoples of most of the older countries are matters entirely familiar to us. We have been taught to regard them as storm signals.

* * * * *

But if we have been taught the grim lesson, we have not yet learned it well enough. We have learned its rudiments and memorized all the catch phrases to be sure, but we are plainly deficient in the advanced courses. We seem slow to learn that we Gentiles as the indomitable majority are shortsighted and unimaginative. We think we've done enough when we cite the Jew's acknowledged civil rights as evidence of the scope of our democracy. We think we have met our opportu-

ities and obligations if now and then we compliment the Jew for his loving kindness and generous philanthropies. We are willing enough to exploit him everywhere as a valued economic convenience and to salaam before him politically in communities where he is strong. It does not seem to occur to us that we owe it to the thing inside ourselves that makes us proud to do better than that, and so set a wholesome example to the natural haters and potential firebrands that we should know infest every community.

If we are to coax the Jew out of his acquired but inevitable group consciousness and natural sensitiveness, and if we are at the same time to sink the fuel that feeds the leaping flames of passion and prejudice and at last burn down the lovely pillars of civilization we shall have to purge ourselves!

That striding Colossus known as the Nordic Gentile must be born again. He must hit the sawdust trail singing, "Just As I Am Without One Plea," lest on some dark tomorrow his tongue cleave to his mouth as he stands aghast at the wreckage of precious things all about him.